

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, and 24 are requested to be amended. No new matter has been added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate status identifier for each claim.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-19 and 20-27 are now pending in this application.

1. Rejection of Claims 18, 21, and 24-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over Failla in View of Katsura

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18, 21, and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Failla (U.S. Patent No. 5,128,662) in view of Katsura (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,324).

Claim 18 has been amended to recite a combination including, among other elements, an expandable display, “wherein images are not displayed on the first viewing area when the display assembly is folded and images are displayed on the second viewing area.” In contrast, Failla discloses a foldable display where the folded portion is in use when folded and the remaining portions are in use. Katsura discloses a flexible liquid display panel intended to preserve an image across a fold in the display. Neither Failla nor Katsura, alone or in any proper combination, disclose an expandable display “wherein images are not displayed on the first viewing area when the display assembly is folded and images are displayed on the second viewing area,” as recited in claim 18 (as amended). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 18, and corresponding dependent claim 21, be withdrawn.

Claim 24 has been amended to recite a combination including, among other elements, “viewing an image on a first viewing area . . . wherein images are not displayed on the second viewing area when folded behind the first viewing area.” In contrast, Failla discloses a second viewing area foldable behind a first viewing area where the second viewing area displays images while viewing an image on the first viewing area. As stated above, Katsura is limited to a flexible liquid display panel intended to preserve an image across a fold in the display. Neither Failla nor Katsura, alone or in any proper combination, discloses “viewing an image on a first viewing area . . . wherein images are not displayed on the second viewing area when folded behind the first viewing area,” as recited in claim 24. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of independent claim 24, and corresponding dependent claims 25-27, be withdrawn.

2. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9-10, 13, and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Bodony et al. in View of Gamsaragan et al. and Failla

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9, 10, 13, and 15 as being unpatentable over Bodony (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,751) in view of Gamsaragan et al. (U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0140690) and Failla. The Applicants first point out that the Examiner stated in the Office Action that the above claims “are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated.” Applicants assume that, in view of the multiple references cited by the Examiner, the present rejection is being made under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination including, among other elements, a display system “wherein during use of the flexible electronic display each section folded behind another section is not exposed when the flexible electronic display is coupled to the host device.” In the Office Action the Examiner correctly noted that “[b]oth Bodony and Gamsaragan do not teach the flexible display being configured in more than two sections, each section being foldable behind on another section.” Also, in contrast to the present claim, Failla discloses a second viewing area foldable behind a first viewing area where the second viewing area is exposed during use. Bodony et al., Gamsaragan et al., and Failla, alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose a display system “wherein during use of the flexible electronic display each section folded behind another section is not exposed when the flexible

electronic display is coupled to the host device.” Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1, and corresponding dependent claims 3-4, be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 13 have been amended to contain similar limitations to amended claim 1. Claim 7 (as amended) recites a combination including, among other elements, a portable electronic device “wherein during use of the flexible electronic display, each section folded behind another section is not exposed when the flexible electronic display is coupled to the host device.” Similarly, claim 13 (as amended) recites a combination including, among other elements, a foldable display assembly “wherein during use of the foldable electronic display, each section folded behind another section is not exposed when the foldable electronic display is coupled to the host device.” Applicants therefore submit that claims 7 and 13 are patentable over Bodony et al., Gamsaragan et al., and Failla, alone or in any proper combination, for at least the reasons listed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of independent claims 7 and 13, and corresponding dependent claims 9, 10, and 15, be withdrawn.

3. Rejection of Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over Bodony in View of Gamsaragan et al. and Failla, and Further in View of Comiskey et al.

In section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodony in view of Gamsaragan et al. and Failla, and further in view of Comiskey et al. (U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0067427).

Claims 2 and 5 depend from independent claim 1. Claims 8 and 11 depend from independent claim 7. Claims 14 and 16 depend from independent claim 13. As noted above, each of independent claims 1, 7, and 13 contains a limitation similar to that of claim 1, which recites a display system “wherein during use of the flexible electronic display each section folded behind another section is not exposed when the flexible electronic display is coupled to the host device.” Comiskey et al. fails to make up for the deficiencies of Bodony et al., Gamsaragan et al., and Failla as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 7, and 13, because Comiskey et al. is directed to a drawing device, and does not address foldable displays or

display sections. Accordingly, Bodony et al., Gamsaragan et al., Failla, and Comiskey et al., alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose a display system “wherein during use of the flexible electronic display each section folded behind another section is not exposed when the flexible electronic display is coupled to the host device,” as recited in claim 1, and as similarly required by claims 7 and 13. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of dependent claims 2 and 5 (as being dependent from independent claim 1), 8 and 11 (as being dependent from independent claim 7), and 15 and 16 (as being dependent from independent claim 13) be withdrawn.

4. Rejection of Claims 6, 12, and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over Bodony in View of Gamsaragan et al. and Failla, and Further in View of Charlier et al.

In section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 12, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodony in view of Gamsaragan et al. and Failla, and further in view of Charlier et al. (U.S. Patent Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0064751).

Claim 6 depends from independent claim 1. Claim 12 depends from independent claim 7. Claim 17 depends from independent claim 13. Charlier et al. fails to make up for the deficiencies of Bodony et al., Gamsaragan et al., and Failla, as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 7, and 13, because Charlier et al. is directed to a holster for electronic devices where the holster has a user interface, and does not address foldable displays or display sections. Accordingly, Bodony et al., Gamsaragan et al., Failla, and Charlier et al., alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose a display system “wherein during use of the flexible electronic display each section folded behind another section is not exposed when the flexible electronic display is coupled to the host device,” as recited in claim 1, and as similarly required by claims 7 and 13. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of dependent claims 6 (as being dependent from independent claim 1), 12 (as being dependent from independent claim 7), and 17 (as being dependent from independent claim 13) be withdrawn.

5. Rejection of Claims 19 and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over Failla in View of Katsura, and Further in View of Comiskey

In section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Failla in view of Katsura, and further in view of Comiskey et al.

Claims 19 and 22 depend from independent claim 18. Claim 18 has been amended to recite a combination including, among other elements, an expandable display, “wherein the first viewing area is not exposed when the display assembly is folded and images are displayed on the second viewing area,” which, as discussed above, is not disclosed by Failla or Katsura, alone or in any proper combination. Comiskey et al. fails to make up for the deficiencies of Failla and Katsura with respect to claim 18. Comiskey et al. is directed to a drawing device, and does not address foldable displays or display sections. Failla, Katsura, and Comiskey et al., alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose an expandable display “wherein the first viewing area is not exposed when the display assembly is folded and images are displayed on the second viewing area.” Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 19 and 22 (as being dependent upon independent claim 18) be withdrawn.

6. Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over Failla in View of Katsura, and Further in View of Charlier et al.

Claim 23 depends from independent claim 18. Claim 18 has been amended to recite a combination including, among other elements, an expandable display, “wherein the first viewing area is not exposed when the display assembly is folded and images are displayed on the second viewing area,” which, as discussed above, is not disclosed by Failla or Katsura, alone or in any proper combination. Charlier et al. fails to make up for the deficiencies of Failla and Katsura with respect to claim 18. Charlier et al. is directed to a holster for electronic devices where the holster has a user interface, and does not address foldable displays or display sections. Failla, Katsura, and Charlier et al., alone or in any proper combination, fail to disclose an expandable display “wherein the first viewing area is not exposed when the display assembly is folded and images are displayed on the second viewing

area.” Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 23 (as being dependent upon independent claim 18) be withdrawn.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

1/27/2006

By

Chad E. Bement

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5554
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Chad E. Bement
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 54,991